

Department of Legislative Services
Maryland General Assembly
2016 Session

FISCAL AND POLICY NOTE
First Reader

Senate Bill 508 (Senators Ramirez and Ferguson)
Judicial Proceedings

Civil Penalties for Shoplifting and Employee Theft - Repeal

This bill repeals statutory provisions establishing liability to a merchant for civil penalties and damages for shoplifting and employee theft.

Fiscal Summary

State Effect: Any reduction in District Court caseloads from the bill is not expected to materially affect State finances.

Local Effect: The bill does not materially affect local finances.

Small Business Effect: Potential meaningful impact on (1) small business retailers currently authorized to seek damages and civil penalties for shoplifting and employee theft and (2) small business law firms and collection firms employed to collect damages and penalties.

Analysis

Current Law: Under statutory provisions pertaining to civil penalties for shoplifting and employee theft, a “responsible person” is (1) any individual, whether an adult or a minor, who commits or attempts to commit an act of shoplifting or employee theft and (2) the parents or legal guardians of an unemancipated minor who commits or attempts to commit an act of shoplifting or employee theft.

A responsible person is civilly liable to a merchant (1) to restore the merchandise to the merchant or, if it is not recoverable, has been damaged, or otherwise has lost all or part of its value, to pay the merchant an amount equal to the stated sales price; (2) to pay the merchant for any other actual damages, not including the loss of time or wages connected

to the apprehension or prosecution of the shoplifter or employee; and (3) subject to the merchant's compliance with certain procedures, to pay the merchant a civil penalty equal to twice the stated sales price, but at least \$50 and up to a maximum of \$1,000.

If a merchant elects to seek this civil penalty, the merchant (1) must comply with specified procedures; (2) may not orally request or accept any payment at the time of apprehension of the responsible person; and (3) may not accept any payment in cash without issuing a receipt for the payment.

While a merchant is prohibited from orally requesting or accepting payment at the time of the alleged shoplifter/employee's apprehension, the merchant is required to send a demand letter to the responsible person. The merchant's initial demand letter must be hand delivered personally to the responsible person or mailed to the responsible person at the person's last known address.

The initial demand letter must:

- identify the act of shoplifting or employee theft alleged to have been committed;
- specify the amount of damages and civil penalty sought and explain how the civil penalty amount was calculated;
- request payment of the damages and civil penalty by cash, money order, certified check, or cashier's check;
- contain a conspicuous notice advising the responsible person that payment of the damages and civil penalty does not preclude the possibility of criminal prosecution but that the payment would not be admissible in any criminal proceeding as an admission or evidence of guilt; and
- specify the date by which the responsible person must make the required payment to avoid civil action, which must be at least 15 days after the date the initial demand letter was hand delivered or postmarked.

If the merchant does not receive payment in full by the due date specified in the initial demand letter, the merchant must send a second demand letter to the responsible person. The second demand letter must (1) comply with specified procedures and contain information similar to what is required for the initial demand letter and (2) advise the responsible person that if the merchant does not receive payment in full by the due date specified in the second demand letter, the responsible person will be subject to immediate institution of a civil suit for damages, penalties, court costs, and reasonable attorney's fees.

A responsible person who complies fully with an initial or second demand letter by the due date specified in the letter may not incur any further civil liability to the merchant for damages arising out of the act of shoplifting or employee theft that was the subject of the

demand letter. If the second demand letter is returned unclaimed to the merchant or if full payment is not otherwise received by the merchant by the due date specified in the second demand letter, the merchant may file a civil action to recover the damages and the civil penalty, together with court costs and reasonable attorney's fees.

A merchant who prevails in a civil action is entitled to an award of court costs and reasonable attorney's fees without regard to the ability of the responsible person to pay those fees and costs.

Criminal prosecution for theft is not a prerequisite to the maintenance of a civil action for damages and civil penalties, and the recovery of damages and penalties by the merchant does not preclude criminal prosecution. However, the payment of damages and penalties by the responsible person to the merchant is not admissible in any criminal proceeding as an admission of guilt or as evidence of guilt.

The procedures described above only apply to the extent that a merchant seeks recovery of the civil penalty authorized under statute for shoplifting or employee theft and do not otherwise limit a merchant or other person from electing to pursue any other civil remedy or cause of action for damages against any responsible person.

The District Court has exclusive original civil jurisdiction in an action for damages and civil penalties for shoplifting and employee theft if the damages and civil penalty claimed do not exceed \$10,000, exclusive of attorney's fees.

Background: As previously stated, the statutory authority of a merchant to collect damages and/or civil penalties for alleged shoplifting and employee theft is independent of the criminal justice process. According to news reports, some retailers, particularly larger retailers, are exercising this authority by escorting alleged shoplifters (including employees) to back rooms and handing demand letters to alleged shoplifters prior to the arrival of law enforcement or even if the merchandise is returned to the merchant. In some instances, alleged shoplifters may have been wrongfully accused and are never charged with a crime but still receive demand letters from law firms and collection firms employed by retailers to collect these damages and penalties.

State Fiscal Effect: The Judiciary advises that it does not have any data from which to determine the magnitude of the reduction in District Court caseloads that may result from the bill. However, the Judiciary does not anticipate that the bill significantly impacts the finances or operations of the District Court.

Additional Information

Prior Introductions: HB 1239 of 2015 passed the House and passed the Senate with amendments. A conference committee was appointed, but the two chambers were not able to reconcile their versions of the bill before the conclusion of the 2015 legislative session.

Cross File: HB 190 (Delegate Lierman, *et al.*) - Judiciary.

Information Source(s): Judiciary (Administrative Office of the Courts), *The Wall Street Journal*, *The Baltimore Sun*, Department of Legislative Services

Fiscal Note History: First Reader - February 8, 2016
min/kdm

Analysis by: Amy A. Devadas

Direct Inquiries to:
(410) 946-5510
(301) 970-5510